

മെന്ന് പറയുന്നതു. (at. 3.27 p.m. the Diwan President took the Chair). അങ്ങിനെ ചെയ്താൽ ന. കൊല്ലംകൊണ്ടു് ഭക്ഷ്യോല്പാദന പരിപാടിയിലുണ്ടായ ആഭിവൃദ്ധിയേക്കാൾ കൂടാതെ കാലം കൊണ്ടു് പത്തുരട്ടി അഭിവൃദ്ധിയുണ്ടാവും. ഇപ്രകാരം ചെയ്തു് കാർഷികജനതയെ അഭിവൃദ്ധിപ്പെടുത്തുവാൻ ഒരു സ്ത്രീ ഉണ്ടാക്കണം. ആരും യാതൊരു തടസ്സവും ഇതിൽ പറയാൻ പാടില്ല. ഉരിപ്പടമില്ലാതെ ജീവിക്കുവാൻ വഴിയില്ലാതെ മറുജവരുടെ ആട്ടം തുച്ഛമനുഭവിക്കുന്ന അധഃകൃതസമുദായത്തിന് കൂടുതൽ ആനുകൂല്യങ്ങൾ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കുമെന്നു പ്രതീക്ഷിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു് ഞാൻ പ്രമേയത്തെ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നു.

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോസഫ് ചിറയത്ത്: സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നു. അധഃകൃത സമുദായത്തെയും, തൊഴിലാളികളെയും സംബന്ധിക്കുന്ന പ്രമേയങ്ങൾ വരുമ്പോൾ, അതിലെ ദോഷവശങ്ങളെപ്പറ്റി പറഞ്ഞാൽ അവലോചനാ വിചാരിക്കപ്പെടുന്ന ഈ കാലത്തു അധഃകൃതരെ സംബന്ധിക്കുന്ന പ്രമേയത്തെപ്പറ്റി പറയാനാണ് ഞാൻ ഭാവിിക്കുന്നത്. എന്തുതന്നെയായാലും പ്രമേയത്തിൽ കടന്നുകൂടിയിട്ടുള്ള പോരായ്മകളെ തിരികുന്നതിന് ഒരു ഭേദഗതി കൂടിയേ കഴിയൂ. ഇത്തരത്തിൽ ഭേദഗതിയോടുകൂടിയ ഒരു പ്രമേയത്തെ മാത്രമേ ഞാൻ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നതിന് ഉദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നുള്ളൂ. ഭക്ഷ്യോല്പാദന പരിപാടിയുടെ കാലാവധിക്കുശേഷം പുറമ്പോക്കു ഭൂമികൾ പതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുന്നതിൽ സാധുക്കളായ മറ്റു മനുഷ്യക്കുംകൂടി അധഃകൃതന്മാരോടൊപ്പം മുൻഗണന കൊടുത്തുകൊണ്ടുള്ളതായ ഒരു പദ്ധതി സ്വീകരിക്കുന്നതാണ് ഏറ്റവും ഉചിതമായിട്ടുള്ളതു്. എന്നുവെച്ചാൽ പലയനോ, പറയനോ അല്ലാത്തതുകൊണ്ടു മാത്രം മറുജവർ കിട്ടേണ്ടതു് കിട്ടാതിരിക്കരുതെന്നു മാത്രമാണ് ഞാൻ നിർദ്ദേശിക്കുന്നുള്ളൂ. ഭക്ഷ്യോല്പാദന പരിപാടിയുടെ കാലാവധിക്കുശേഷം പുറമ്പോക്കു ഭൂമികൾ പതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുമ്പോൾ അധഃകൃതർക്കും അവരെപ്പോലെയുള്ള മറ്റു സമുദായങ്ങളിൽ ഉള്ള സാധുക്കൾക്കും മുൻഗണന കൊടുത്തുകൊണ്ടു് പതിച്ചുകൊടുക്കുക എന്നുള്ള ഭേദഗതിയോടുകൂടിയ പ്രമേയത്തെയാണ് ഞാൻ പിന്താങ്ങുന്നതു്.

* മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ: സർ, ഞാനും ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ പിന്താങ്ങാൻ തന്നെയാണ് വിചാരിക്കുന്നത്. പക്ഷെ എന്തുതന്നെ ന്യായമുണ്ടായാലും ആ ന്യായങ്ങൾ പറയുന്നതു് സമുദായക്കുറുപ്പാണ് എന്നാണ് ചിലർ പറയുന്നതു്. സമുദായങ്ങളിൽ വളരെക്കാലമായി നിലനിന്നുവരുന്ന വിഭേദംകൊണ്ടാണ് ഈ വിചാരമുണ്ടാകുന്നതു്. മറുജവരെ തെറ്റിദ്ധരിപ്പിക്കുവാൻ ചില വാക്കുകൾ ആവർത്തിച്ചുവർത്തിച്ചു സിംഹഗർജ്ജനം ചെയ്താൽ, മറുജവർക്കു എത്രതന്നെ ന്യായമുണ്ടെങ്കിലും ആ ന്യായങ്ങൾ പറയാൻ ഇടകൊടുക്കാതെ, അഥവാ പറഞ്ഞാൽ തന്നെ അതു് അന്യായമാണെന്നു് തെറ്റിദ്ധരിപ്പിച്ചാൽ പല വലിയ വലിയ കാര്യങ്ങളും നിഷ്പ്രയാസം സാധിക്കാമെന്നു് മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുള്ള ചില വ്യക്തികൾ ഈ കൌൺസിലിൽ മാത്രമല്ല, നമ്മുടെ രാജ്യത്തും പുറമേയും ധാരാളമുണ്ടു് എന്ന് ഞാൻ മനസ്സിലാക്കിയിട്ടുണ്ടു്. അങ്ങിനെയുള്ളവരുടെ വേഴ്ച നശിപ്പിക്കണമെന്നു് എനിക്ക് വിചാരമില്ല. പക്ഷെ, ഇങ്ങനെയുള്ള വേഴ്ചക്കാരെ എത്രക്കണമെന്നുള്ള മനസ്ഥിതിയാണ് എനിക്കുള്ളതു്. അധഃകൃതർ നന്നാകേണ്ട എന്നോ, അവർ നന്നാകുന്നതിന് ന്യായമായ സഹായം ചെയ്തുകൊടുക്കേണ്ട എന്നോ ഉള്ള അഭിപ്രായം എനിക്കില്ല.

Mr. President: Is the Hon'ble Member going to speak for some more time?

Mr. P. Narayana Menon (Tripunithura): Yes, Sir.

Mr. President: If so, I must ask the Honble Member to stop. We shall now take up the Adjournment motion.

ADJOURNMENT MOTION

Lock-out in the Alliance Industries, Tripunithura

*Mr. P. K. Dewar (Nominated): Mr. President, Sir, under rule 21 of the Legislative Council Rules I move for the adjournment of the business of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance to wit the illegal lock-out in the "Alliance Industries", Tripunithura and the failure of the Government to take proper action. I am constrained to move such a motion because of the importance of the subject I am going to deal with here. Since the outbreak of the hostilities several ordinances, orders and rule have been brought into force here, in the State in the interest, I must say, of the working class of the State. They have been forced even to their disadvantage to work in factories, even in the worst conditions, not to leave the place of their work, not leave the place where they live and the workers have been putting up with all

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member

these things. They have been loyal and law-abiding. In these rules there are some little provision to protect the interests of the workers, these interests, I regret to say have not been properly protected by the Government so far. The Hon'ble Member for Ernakulam yesterday pointed out that in the Essential Services Ordinance there is a rule giving right for the Government to fix a minimum wages in undertakings where the workers have not got the option of leaving their job, even if they happen to get higher wages else where. The Government have not so far done anything to fix the minimum living wages for the workers in such undertakings. Recently there was a trade dispute in Ernakulam. The Government issued an order under the Defence of India Rules on the 23rd of October 1945/7th Thulam 1121 by which order the Government said:—"No person employed in any undertaking shall go on strike in connection with any trade dispute without having given to his employer within one month before striking not less than 14 days' previous notice in writing of his intention so to do." This was brought in because there was occurrence there. The workers of a particular undertaking threatened to strike to get some of their grievances redressed. In the same order it is stated that—"No employer of any undertaking shall lock-out his employees in connection with any trade dispute without having given to his employees within one month before locking out not less than 14 days' previous notice exhibited prominently in his undertaking, of his intention so to do, provided no such notice shall be necessary while a strike exists in the undertaking, but a notice of the lock-out shall be sent on the day on which lock-out is declared to such authority as may be specified by Government either generally or for particular areas or particular classes of undertakings."

There is an undertaking in Trippunittura which is called the Alliance Industry. A trade dispute arose there. Some months ago, a trade union was organised and the workers of that particular industry joined that organisation. As result of this one of the workers had been discharged and the Secretary of the organisation was dismissed. Then the workers wanted to raise their wages. They put in a tabulated statement before the management saying that the wages that they asked for is even after granting that the management still get a reasonable profit not less than 28 per cent. There was some sort of conciliation and the management of the industries raised the wages of Rs. 14 and Rs. 14 to Rs. 17-8-0. Subsequently the Alliance Industry management wanted a wage cut against which the workers protested. A protest meeting was arranged and a resolution was passed in that meeting asking the management not to bring into force the wage cut. On the 27th of Thulam the 12th of November when the wages were disbursed to the workers in that particular industry the management cut down the wages and the original wages were not paid. The workers refused to take wages. They said "we are not prepared to abide by any wage cut. We are prepared to continue work. In the meanwhile you can negotiate with our organisation." The next day on the 13 November the workers reported themselves to work but the management kept them out. The management insisted from them an undertaking in writing that they shall work for a lesser amount of wages or that they shall abide by the wage cut which they do not agree. The management also insisted that besides the undertaking in writing they must give some guarantee also so that they will be allowed to work there. The workers said "we are not prepared to work. Let the dispute be settled between the union and the management but allow us to work." The management kept them out. That was the lock-out. Under the trade disputes act a lock-out has been defined. "Lock-out" means the closing of a place of employment, or the suspension of work, or the refusal by an employer to continue to employ any number of persons employed by him, where such closing, suspension or refusal occurs in consequence of a dispute and is intended for the purpose of compelling those persons, or of aiding another employer in compelling persons employed by him, to accept terms or conditions of or affecting employment." Here the management kept them out because the management wanted to coerce them to accept the wage cut proposed by the management. Hence the action of the management is definitely a lock-out. A lock-out under the recent order passed by Government on the 23rd October 1945, cannot be declared by the management without giving full 14 days' notice within one month. "No employer of any undertaking shall lock-out his employees in connection with any trade dispute without having given to his employees within one month before locking-out not less than 14 days' previous notice exhibited prominently in his undertaking, of his intention so to do." The Manager has failed to put up notice in any place in the factory nor notified their union or the organisation. Immediately on the 13th this was done. On the 14th the workers tried conciliatory methods. The worker's representative met the management but the management were not prepared to allow the workers to get in. On the 14th of November a representative of the organisation sent in a telegram to the Commissioner of Police, the Labour Commissioner and to the Diwan of Cochin saying that the lock-out is continuing. Then

the Manager had attempted a partial lock-out from morn to noon on that occasion also a telegram has been sent. But the lock-out he has declared on the 13th November is still continuing. To-day 28 of November though telegrams were sent to the Government and to the officers of the Government no action is so far taken. On the 3rd Vrischigam even after granting that there was no telegram sent to the Commissioner of Police or to any authority it cannot be said that the police authorities who ought have taken cognisance of these could not have known what is transpiring. On the 18th November, 3rd Vrischigam a public meeting was organised. I was presiding that public meeting and I saw a Police Short-hand reporter one or two head constables at the place. They had also got copies of the notice. In that notice it is said.—

“നാട്ടുകാരടേയും അധികാരികളടേയും അടിയന്തിര ശ്രദ്ധ ഇക്കാര്യത്തിൽ പതിയേണ്ട സമയം അതിക്രമിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു. നിതൃവാവശ്യസാധനങ്ങളുടെ വില കുറഞ്ഞിട്ടില്ല. ഏറ്റവും കുറഞ്ഞ കൂലിതന്നെ കുറയ്ക്കപ്പെടുന്നു. തുടർന്നു തൊഴിലില്ലായ്മയിലേക്കു അവരെ ഉന്തിയിരിക്കുന്നു. നിയമത്തിന്റെ മുമ്പിൽ നടക്കുന്ന അക്രമമാണിതു.”

They say that this an injustice against the rules of the Government because there rules passed by the Government under the Defence of India Rules on the 23rd of October which says.—“that the management of any undertaking shall not declare a lock-out without exhibiting notice of his intention to do so in a prominent place in the undertaking”.

“യേക്കുമായ ഒരന്തരീക്ഷമാണിതിന്റെ പിന്നിൽ ഉരുണ്ടുകൂടുന്നത്. നാട്ടുകാർക്കു തുണിയുണ്ടാക്കിക്കൊടുക്കുന്ന ഈ തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ നേരെ നടത്തുന്ന ഈ അനീതി നോക്കി നില്ക്കുന്നത് നമുക്കു ചേർന്നു പ്രവൃത്തിയല്ല. ഇക്കാര്യത്തിലടിപെട്ട് ഈ നെയ്ത്തു തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു മുമ്പത്തെ കൂലി ൧൭ ക. വൃണ. കിട്ടുവാനും ശരിക്കു എല്ലാവർക്കും പണികിട്ടുവാനും വേണ്ട എല്ലാ ട്രക്കർ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കുവാനും ജോലിയില്ലാതായിത്തീർന്ന തൊഴിലാളികൾക്കു ജോലി കിട്ടുന്നതുവരെയുള്ള ജീവിതത്തിന്നു വേണ്ട സഹായ സഹകരണങ്ങൾ ചെയ്തു കൊടുക്കുവാനും നാട്ടുകാരോടും അധികാരികളോടും ഞങ്ങൾ അപേക്ഷിക്കുന്നു.

ഇക്കാര്യം പൊതുജനങ്ങളുടേയും ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റേയും ദൃഷ്ടിയിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുവാൻ ഒരു വമ്പിച്ച പൊതുയോഗവും ഘോഷയാത്രയും വൃശ്ചികം ൩ ൦-ാം-നു തൊയറാഴ്ച പകൽ ൫ മണിക്കു നടത്തുവാൻ തീരുമാനിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു.”.....

That is on the 18th November 1945. I saw myself there the Police Short-hand reporter and one or two head constables. Accusations were made even against the police officers. And I in my speech wondered how the management of that concern is now not in the lock up. Sir, there are a few cases pending in some courts here for an alleged sit-down strike by a few work ers in the Tatas and some other concerns. The police do not make extensive enquiries there. Immediately they knew that there was an allegation against a few workers for not doing their work and for having done sit-down strick those persons were arrested. They do not make much elaborate enquiries. They simply arrested these workers and a case has been charge-sheeted. The case is pending before the First Class Magistrate, Ernakulam. Here the lock-out against the order promulgated by the Government of Cochin had been declared by the Manager and it was declared on the 13th of November and today 28th of November we find that the management is at large and the management has got the power and the option to continue the lock-out and coerce the poor workers even when they could not make their both ends meet. I request the Government and the House to consider the hardships to which these poor workers and their family are put to for 18 days. They have been working through out, but they have not been in a position because of the poor wages and because of the high cost of living, they were not able to put up by anything, such workers are compelled to go and stand before the industrial undertaking from morn to eve waiting to see whether the management will be willing to call them to work. I cannot understand, Sir, why for all these days the Government have not been in a position to take any action against the management. I am not also aware where any explanation has been called for from the management of this industry. I understand that at meeting of the Master weavers at Trippunittura including the management of this particular concern where the Labour Commissioner put in a proposal before these people that he will see that about 25 per cent or 30 per cent of the stock of this undertakings will be allowed to be exported outside the State. He said that he would ask the Assistant Textile-Commissioner to give them such permits and until that time these workers may be allowed the original wages and they will be allowed to work. The management was not willing to accept that, though the workers were willing to re-open the question if in the case the management have got the required permits. It is not

my intention, Sir, to cause any slur or censure the Government. It is my intension to bring to the attention to this Government and that is, say that the poor workers are victimised in this way and our Government are looking at it without taking any serious action. It was, I think, argued yesterday that the Government are not aware whether this undertaking wherein the Government and whether the notification referred to on 23rd October passed by the Government under the Defence of India Rules is applicable.

Mr. M. Sivarama Menon (*Advocate-General*): There is no doubt entertained by the Government.

Mr. P. K. Dewar (*Nominated*): I am glad that Government have conceded that this undertaking and wherein Government would have enquired and now the case is that the Government have not done their duty. If at this moment the Government are prepared to take proper action in the matter and to safeguard the interests of workers, I may not press probably for a vote of this House. What I want is that the Government should take prompt action as they would have taken if it was the workers going on a strike without notice. I therefore place these facts before the Government and the House and I shall be very glad if the Government would certainly held up the promise to me that proper action be immediately taken against the management of the institution which have acted contravening the rules and the Laws of the State.

Mr. President: I would ask one question of the Hon'ble Member. How many people are affected in this matter?

Mr. P. K. Dewar (*Nominated*): In this particular concern only 18 workers are effected but this is only a test case.

Mr. President: I am asking about this particular case.

Mr. P. K. Dewar (*Nominated*): 13 workers are now kept out in this particular concern.

Mr. President: Thank you.

Mr. Jos. K. Verghese (*Trichur-South*): We would like to hear the Government in this matter.

Mr. C. J. Mathew (*Joint Secretary to Government*): At the very outset, I wish to inform the House that the charge that Government are not taking prompt action in a matter like this is absolutely unfounded. I shall disclose the facts and leave it to the House to judge whether there has been any slackness at all on the part of Government, either deliberate or accidental. As a matter of fact, the first information Government received with regard to this matter was from a telegram they received from the President of the Weavers' Union on 8th November 1945. It read as follows:—"Diwan, Ernakulam. Alliance Industries deducting wages.—stop—Protest resolutions passed.—stop. Police searching Labour Union House. stop. Unauthorised.—stop. Workers terrorised.—stop. Lock-out today without notice—Pray intervene." On that very day this information was communicated by Government to the Labour Commissioner who had also by that time received a similar telegram direct. On receipt of information he rushed to the spot at once, the very next day itself, that is on the 9th, and made enquiries. As a result it was found out that the so-called "lock-out" referred to in the telegram was with reference to an incident which took place on the 7th. On the 7th, about 8 workmen left the institution without taking permission from the management to attend a certain public meeting that was being held there on that day. When they came for work the next day, the management told them "You having disobeyed the rules and left the factory without taking proper permission, you would not be allowed to work for half-a-day." Thus, they were suspended from work for a few hours, while those who went out with permission were all allowed to join duty. Those 8 persons who violated the rules were punished by suspending them for half a day, but they were allowed to resume work in the afternoon. This they construed as a "lock-out". When the Commissioner went to the spot and enquired into the details he was satisfied that it did not constitute a "lock-out." Both the Commissioner of Police and the Labour Commissioner therefore reported there was no "lock-out" on that day. So Government had no occasion to take any action on the basis of the information contained in the telegram.

The next information that Government received was on the 14th. Another telegram which stated:—"Management, Alliance Industries. Lock-out continuing." This second telegram was understood as referring to the "lock-out" alleged to have taken place on the 7th.

The next information which the Government received was on the 24th of November, that is, last Sunday. It was from the President of the Trippunittura Weavers' Union. He sent a petition to the Government on the 23rd. It was received by Government on the 24th. From that petition Government came to know for the first time that the management was refusing work to the employees. On that day, that is, on the 24th, I also received a letter, an unsigned letter, with the letter-head of Mr. Dewar printed in it. The letter contained certain allegations against the management. Immediately I rang up the Labour Commissioner who came down by the next train on Sunday itself. I showed him the petition and the letter. He then told me that between the 8th and the 24th he had visited the factory at Trippunittura twice or thrice, on the 9th, 18th and again on the 21st, but that at no time had this matter been brought to his pointed attention by the employees. He said that all that was pressed before him was to take steps for the restoration of the old rates which were reduced by the management. He was doing accordingly all that was humanly possible for getting the old rates restored. Thus I want to make it clear to the House that till the 24th, Government, nor the Labour Commissioner, had been informed by anyone concerned about the denial of work to the employees by the management. Is it then fair to accuse the Government of any inaction in this matter?

My Hon'ble friend who moved for the adjournment of the House was saying that there was a public meeting on the 18th November to protest against the "lock-out" and that there was a leaflet circulated. It was certainly up to him to have then intimated the fact to the Government. He could also have sent a copy of the leaflet to the Government inviting their attention to it. If the Hon'ble member Mr. Dewar was so anxious to see that the rights of the workers were properly safeguarded and that necessary action was set on foot by Government immediately, it was up to him to have made a request to the Government long before 24th of November. But he kept quiet. On the 25th, as I submitted to the House, the Labour Commissioner as well as the Police Commissioner went to the spot. They are now making detailed enquiries. Government will certainly take appropriate action in the matter. Government will not lag behind. From the facts I have placed before the House, I hope, the House will certainly bear with me that there has been absolutely no case of any delay whatever on the part of the Government in taking the appropriate action that was called for. Government will be always meeting out even-handed justice between the employees and the employers; and in this case as I have already informed the House, Government did not slacken their action in any manner whatever.

Mr. K. S. Panicker (Ezhuvas-Trichur): On a point of information may I know what is the working capital of this industry?

Mr. C. J. Mathew (Joint Secretary to Government): It is a very small undertaking. There are only about 20 hand-loom or so worked by about 30 people.

Mr. P. K. Dever (Nominated): On a point of information Sir, may I know, whether it was not on the 12th when they went to receive the wages that they were told that their wages have been reduced when they protested that they were not prepared to receive the wages at the reduced rate and that they should be paid at the old rates?

Mr. President: The Hon'ble Member has already made his speech. He has a right of reply at the end.

Mr. P. K. Dewar (Nominated): I am only asking for information.

Mr. President: This is not the time for doing it.

Mr. P. Govinda Menon (Ernakulam): I am extremely glad to note that the Government now prepared to meet even-handed justice between labour and employer.

Mr. President: They have always been prepared to do so.

***Mr. P. Govinda Menon (Ernakulam):** I am happy to note that. The particular question now brought before this House by the adjournment motion by the Hon'ble Member for

*Speech not corrected by the Honourable Member.

Labour can be understood and the importance attached to it by the Hon'ble Member for Labour can only be appreciated if it is looked at in the context in which labour question were being tackled by this Government for the last several months. It has been disclosed here that this is a small undertaking in which about Rs. 10,000 has been invested with 30 workers. It is more in the nature of a cottage industry than that of a factory. Therefore this is a matter small in itself. But it is rather unfortunate that it is this matter that came up for discussion before this House in the long series of labour disputes and troubles that took place in this State in the last so many months. The anxiety of the protagonists of labour—I believe the member for labour has introduced this motion in that capacity—can really be understood and appreciated only if this House is made aware so to say a sort of anarchy that was prevailing in the realm of industrial labour in this State. I do not want to find fault with any officer for that purpose because this matter came on all on a sudden before the Government and probably Government may not have had ample time to devise the machinery and to set up proper machinery for meeting the situation. Immediately after the cessation of hostilities, employers everywhere in the State have started a sort of blitz-kerig against the workers of the State. From the Port area several thousands of employees have been dismissed or discharged one after another. In Chalakkudi in the Ply-wood Factory immediately after the war was over, on the ground that the war is over, several employees were discharged. In several other places also that took place. A certain matter is now pending consideration before the adjudicator. Therefore I do not want to refer to that. If employers in our State did these things without any difficulty, almost with impunity, there is no wonder in their doing it, because those employers were not made to understand about the way in which Government will tackle these things if they violate the law. As I had often occasion to point to Government even on the floor of this House, there are several very good legislations on the Statute Book of Cochin intended to advance the cause of labour. Even in the last budget session of this Council a very important peace of legislation namely the Industrial Statistics Act, has been placed on the Statute Book. But one has reason to suspect whether after these legislations that are placed one after another on the Statute Book really denote any policy on the part of this Government with respect to labour. I have my own doubt about it; because these are all legislations of the Government of India which are simply being copied here without any intention whatsoever at least as things at present stand, without any intention on the part of the Government to do anything for labour. I don't want to cite or refer to many of these legislations. But to bring the matter to the attention of this House, I wish to refer to one section of the Essential Services Proclamation. During the war several employers in Cochin were displaying a sort of anxiety to see that their concerns were brought under the purview of the Essential Services Proclamation because if that were done several advantages will be obtained by these employers in the matter of controlling labour. Section 5 of the Essential Services Proclamation says.—

"No person engaged in any employment or class of employment to which this Proclamation applies". Therefore the Proclamation must be made applicable to them by notification by Government. "Who (a) disobeys the lawful order given to him in the course of such employment, or (b) without reasonable excuse abandons such employment or absents himself from work, or (c) departs from any area specified in an order under sub-section (1) of section 4 without the consent of the authority making that order, etc. etc.," is guilty of an offence "under this Proclamation": So that if this Proclamation were made applicable to any employment they get all these advantages. Disobedience of an order made by the Manager is made punishable under this Proclamation; and if any person resigns from the service or absents himself without reasonable excuse from attending their work, then again it is made punishable. But then a corresponding duty is placed upon the Government when this Proclamation is made applicable to any establishment. I ask this Government whether they have discharged that duty, whether they have made any enquiries as to whether any action in that behalf is necessary. I refer to section 6 of the Proclamation which says: that "Government may make rules regulating or empowering a specified authority to regulate the wages and other conditions of service of persons or any class of persons engaged in any employment or class of employment declared under section 3 to be an employment or class of employment to which this Proclamation applies. So that whereas in section 5 the liberty of action of the worker is restricted under stringent provisions of this Proclamation, a corresponding duty is placed upon Government to see that conditions of labour are properly laid down for these employments and the minimum wages which must be paid by the employments to the employees should also be laid down. I put it to the Government whether before applying this provision to the several

employments, any action whatsoever was taken to regulate the wages of the employees and to regulate the conditions of work there. That has not been done and in so far as that has not been done, and in so far as several difficulties have had to be experienced by labour on account of this, I say that this Government in putting these legislations on the statute book, were merely copying the Central legislations and were not laying down any policy regarding industrial labour.

One thing more, Sir. Under section 5 of this Proclamation, as referred to by the Hon'ble Member for Labour at least two persons to my knowledge are now being prosecuted. I am not referring to the merits of the case. But then the Proclamation expressly says that any person who without reasonable excuse abandons the work is guilty. What happened was this. In the Tata about 3000 persons struck work and I do not say that the strike was legal—it was illegal. On the very day, two workers were arrested and are being prosecuted. Probably, technically they are right. But did this Government stopped to consider whether they had any reasonable excuse in doing so; and if when *prima facie* offences are committed by employers this Government are trying to investigate whether there had been reasonable excuse or not, is there not something in what we say? When it is a matter connected with labour and it is the employer that is concerned, Government conduct interminable enquiries through the police officers, through the Labour Commissioner, and not when it is the employee that is concerned. That is why I say Government had not been doing even-handed justice between labour and capital. That is why I welcomed the statement of the Hon'ble Joint Secretary to Government that they propose to do it. No other insinuation is there.

Now, Sir, with respect to the incident now before this House, It must be understood and viewed in the context that the things that are happening in this State, I do not want to make use of my position as a member of this House which I consider to be a position of privilege and trust to condemn or to pass judgment upon the conduct of this person or that person. If I do that either the labourers or the employers will be prejudiced. That is not my intention. I want only to bring to the notice of this House, and this matter I believe has been made an occasion by the Hon'ble Member for labour to bring it again to the notice of this House that a sort of anarchy is prevailing in the realm of industrial labour here. The machinery constituted by Government is not at all useful or sufficient to cope with the situation. I wish in this connection to refer to one matter which happened in the Presidency of Madras in which I had some personal part. In the Brunton Co. in British Cochin certain persons were dismissed without notice. It was an offence under a certain section of a certain Proclamation in force in British India. At once the Union wrote about the matter to the department concerned in Madras. Now, Sir, if the Labour Commissioner like a Police Constable will move about from place to place interviewing this Manager and interviewing that Manager trying to get information from him, will that Manager have any respect for the Commissioner? That is the duty of another officer altogether. What we require is a body or a board or a tribunal sitting permanently which will summon both the employer and employee before them whenever industrial disputes arise which will elicit or evoke feelings of respect and fear not alone in labour but also in the management. Such a body, such a board, such a tribunal should be established and such an officer must sit in judgment over these things. Here, what is the state of affairs disclosed from the speech made by the Hon'ble Joint Secretary? In the case of these petty managements employing about 30 workers where about Rs. 10,000 is invested, the Commissioner of Labour, a Head of the Department, who has to hold the scales even between labour and capital in this State, is reported to have run about to that place twice or thrice. Therefore, I am not referring to the officer concerned. Let it be perfectly understood that the integrity of the officer or the anxiety of the officer to do justice between labour and employment is not at all in issue in this matter. But then the complaint is regarding the machinery constituted. Such things will not leave to any tangible result. The Labour Commissioner should not be expected to run about from factory to factory, to interview the manager at his sweet will and pleasure. That must not be the function of a departmental head who has to mete out evenhanded justice between labour and employers. That is all what we mean.

മിസ്റ്റർ ജോസ് കെ. വർഗ്ഗീസ്: രണ്ടുമാസത്തിനു മുമ്പ് ഈ ആലോചനയുണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ലെ?

Mr. P. Govinda Menon (Ernakulam): That is what I refer to. What is the nervousness of my Hon'ble friend for Trichur South in this matter? We are repeatedly complaining that the Labour Commissioner as present constituted—I am referring to the office, not to the

officer—is absolutely useless for serving the purpose for which it is intended, no reflection on any person whatsoever. When the previous officer was there, then also there were repeated cries and complaints and protests from labour regarding the incompetance and incapacity and uselessness of that officer to deal with labour. But the matter did not come up before this House. My Hon'ble friend for Trichur-South not being conversant with the activities of labour did not know it. Bags and bags of complaints have been presented with respect to the previous officer also—let it not be understood by any member of this House that I, as any other member of this House, have anything against the person of the present Labour Commissioner. It is only against the machinery, against devices constituted by Government to deal with that question. In a statement I had occasion to issue regarding the Supplementary Demands which this House had occasion to throw out at my instance, a demand intended for the Labour Department newly constituted, I made the whole position clear. The issue was not whether the Labour Department is necessary or not. The issue was that the Labour Department as at present constituted is useless for the purpose for which it is intended. With these remarks, I second the motion brought before this House by the Hon'ble Member for Labour with the hope that these questions will engage the earnest consideration of Government and something better, something more effective and something more useful will be done with respect to the solution of disputes regarding labour and the management in our country.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : സർ, ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ എതിർക്കുന്നു. ഈ രാജ്യത്ത് എത്ര മുതലാളികളുണ്ടെന്നും തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ സംഖ്യ എത്രയെന്നും മുതലാളികളും തൊഴിലാളികളും തമ്മിലുള്ള ഇടപാടുകൾ നിയന്ത്രിക്കേണ്ടത് എങ്ങിനെയാണെന്നും ഇപ്പോൾ അത് നിയന്ത്രിക്കുന്നതിലുള്ള വിഷമങ്ങളെന്തെല്ലാമെന്നും വിവരിക്കുന്നതിന്നു ഞാൻ ഒരുക്കമില്ല. തൃപ്പൂണിത്തുറയിൽ അലയൻസ് ഫാക്ടറി എന്നു പറയുന്ന ഒരു ഫാക്ടറിയുണ്ട്. പതിനായിരം ഉറപ്പികയാണ് അതിന്റെ മൂലധനം. ൩൦ ആളുകളാണ് അതിൽ വേലക്കാരായിട്ടുള്ളത്. കേൾക്കുമ്പോൾ ഇതുവളരെ ചെറുതായിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു സ്ഥാപനമായിട്ടു തോന്നുമെങ്കിലും തങ്ങളുടെ നാട്ടിൽ ഇതുവലിയൊരു സ്ഥാപനമാണ്. അവിടെയുള്ള മുതലാളികളിൽ “പൊട്ടക്കുളത്തിൽ പുളവൻ ഫണിറൻ” എന്നു പറഞ്ഞതു പോലെ ഈ ഫാക്ടറി നിയന്ത്രിക്കുന്ന മുതലാളിയാണ് ഏറ്റവും വലിയ മുതലാളി. അദ്ദേഹം ഈ ഫാക്ടറി തുടങ്ങിട്ട് ഏതാണ്ട് രണ്ടുമൂന്നു കൊല്ലമായി എന്നുതോന്നുന്നു. യുദ്ധം തുടങ്ങുന്നതിന്നു മുമ്പുള്ള കൂലി എന്താണെന്നു നിശ്ചയമില്ല. യുദ്ധം തുടങ്ങിയതിനു ശേഷം പലഗഡുവുകളായി ൧൦ രാത്രിൽ നൂലു നെയ്യുന്നതിന് ൧൭ ക. വു. റ്റു. വരെ കൂലി വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചു. നെയ്യുന്ന മൂണ്ടിന് തക്കതായ വിലകിട്ടിയതുകൊണ്ടാണ് കൂലി അങ്ങിനെ വർദ്ധിപ്പിച്ചത്. ഈ കൂലി രണ്ടുകൊല്ലത്തോളം കൊടുത്തിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇപ്പോൾ നെയ്യുണ്ടാക്കുന്ന വസ്തുക്കൾക്കു ചിലവുകുറഞ്ഞു. അതുകൊണ്ടു ഇനിയും ഈ കൂലി കൊടുക്കുകയാണെന്നുണ്ടെങ്കിൽ അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്റെ ഫാക്ടറി പൂട്ടിയിടേണ്ടതായി വരുമെന്നു അദ്ദേഹത്തിന്നു തോന്നി. കാരണം പതിനായിരം ഉറപ്പികയാണ് മൂലധനം. ഫാക്ടറിയിൽ ഉണ്ടാക്കുന്ന സാധനങ്ങൾ ചിലവാകുന്നില്ല. ആ നിലക്ക് കൂലി കുറക്കാതെ മൂലധനം ഉപയോഗിച്ചു അധികം ചരക്കുകൾ നിർമ്മിക്കുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അധികം താമസിയാതെ ഫാക്ടറി പൂട്ടിയിടേണ്ടിവരും. അതുകൂടാതെ കഴിക്കണമെന്ന വിചാരത്തോടുകൂടി കഴിഞ്ഞമാസം ൨൦-ാം-നു അന്നുമുതൽ ൧൭ ക. വു. റ്റു. കൂലിയായിരുന്നത് ൧൪ ക. യായി കുറച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു എന്നൊരു നോട്ടീസ് കൊടുത്തു. ആ നോട്ടീസിനെക്കുറിച്ച് അവിടെയുള്ള തൊഴിലാളികൾക്ക് വലിയ പരാതിയൊന്നും ഉണ്ടായിരുന്നില്ല.

ഒരു സംഗതികൂടിയുള്ളത് ഞാൻ പറയുവാൻ വിട്ടുപോയി. അതായത് അവിടെ മൂന്നു നാലു രാഷ്ട്രീയകക്ഷികളുണ്ട്. ഒന്നു കമ്മ്യൂണിസ്റ്റ് പാർട്ടി. ഒന്നു കോൺഗ്രസ്സിൽ നിന്നു മുളച്ചുണ്ടായതാണെന്നു പറയുന്ന പ്രജാമണ്ഡലമാണ്. വേറെ ഒന്നു സോഷ്യലിസ്റ്റ് എന്ന പേരിനാൽ അറിയപ്പെടുന്നു. ഇങ്ങിനെ അനേകം രാഷ്ട്രീയകക്ഷികൾ അവിടെയുണ്ട്. ഈ രാഷ്ട്രീയകക്ഷികളിൽ ഓരോന്നിന്നും തൊഴിലാളികളെ മുഴുവൻ സ്വാധീനിച്ചാൽ കൊള്ളാമെന്നുള്ള മത്സരബുദ്ധി നിമിത്തം തൊഴിലാളികളെ വട്ടത്തിലാക്കുന്നതിനുവേണ്ടി അവർക്കു ആവശ്യമില്ലെങ്കിലും അവരെ സഹായിക്കുകയെന്നുള്ള നാട്ടുത്തിൽ അനാവശ്യമായ പല സംഗതികളിലും എപ്പെടാറുണ്ട്. ആ കൂട്ടത്തിൽ കൂലികുറഞ്ഞു എന്നു കേട്ടപ്പോൾ വെള്ളം വറ്റിയ കളത്തിന്റെ നാലുഭാഗത്തും പരുന്തുകളും കാക്കകളും വന്നു കൂടുന്നപോലെ, ഇതുതന്നെ തരമെന്നുകരുതി ഈ രാഷ്ട്രീയകക്ഷികളിലെ അംഗങ്ങളും തൊഴിലാളികളുടെ ചുറ്റും അടുത്തുകൂടി. മുതലാളികൾ തൊഴിലാളി നിയമ

ങ്ങൾ എന്തെല്ലാമാണ് അവയെ എന്തെല്ലാംതരത്തിൽ ഇൻറർപ്രട്ട് ചെയ്യാമെന്നുള്ളത് ഒന്നും ഇഷ്ടമില്ല. അതുകണ്ടു ചിലർ മുതലാളിയെ പറിക്കുവാനുള്ള അവസരം ഇതുതന്നെയാണെന്നു കരുതി തൊഴിലാളികളെക്കണ്ടു “നിങ്ങൾ ൧൭ ക. വു ണ. കിട്ടിയല്ലോ തെ ജോലിക്കു പോകേണ്ട ൧൭൪ ക. തന്നെ കിട്ടണമെന്നുള്ളത് നിർബ്ബന്ധിക്കണം” എന്നുപദേശിച്ചു. സാധുതൊഴിലാളികൾ അതു വിശ്വസിച്ചു ഉടനെതന്നെ മീറിംഗ് കൂടി. പ്രമേയം പാസാക്കി അയക്കേണ്ട ആളുകൾക്കൊക്കെ അയച്ചുകൊടുത്തു. മുതലാളിയേയും അറിയിച്ചു. ഇതെല്ലാം കഴിഞ്ഞിട്ടും മുതലാളിക്ക് ഒരു ചലനവും ഉണ്ടായില്ല. രാജ്യകാഴ്ചക്കുപോലും കുറഞ്ഞ നിരക്കനുസരിച്ചു ൧൪ ക. യായി കൂലിതീർത്തു.

മിസ്റ്റർ എ. ഈച്ചരമേനോൻ : എല്ലാവരും മേടിപ്പോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : എല്ലാവരും കൂലിവാങ്ങുവാൻ വന്നിരുന്ന കുറഞ്ഞ കൂലിക്ക് വേലയെടുക്കുവാൻ തരമില്ലെന്നു ചില ആളുകൾ വാദിച്ചു. ഈ കൂലിയല്ലാതെ തരികയില്ലെന്നു ഫാക്ടറി ഉടമസ്ഥനും പറഞ്ഞു. അതിന്നു സമ്മതമില്ലെങ്കിൽ ഞങ്ങൾ വേല ചെയ്യാൻ ഒരുക്കമില്ല എന്നു ചിലർ പറഞ്ഞു. കരനേരം അവർ യാതൊരു ജോലിയും ചെയ്യാതെ അങ്ങോട്ടും ഇങ്ങോട്ടും കളിച്ചും സല്ലപിച്ചും നടന്നിരുന്നു. ഇതു കണ്ട് “ഇങ്ങിനെ സല്ലപിച്ചു നടക്കുവാൻ ഇവിടെ സാധിക്കയില്ല. ഒന്നുകിൽ നിങ്ങൾ വേല എടുക്കണം, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ പുറത്തു പോകണം” എന്നു ഫാക്ടറി ഉടമസ്ഥൻ പറഞ്ഞു. അപ്പോൾ അവർ പുറത്തിറങ്ങി പോയി. ഇതാണ് സംഭവത്തിന്റെ ചുരുക്കം. ഇതു ലോക്കൗട്ടോ വാക്കൗട്ടോ ട്രൈക്കോ എന്നൊന്നെന്നു എനിക്കു പിടത്തമില്ല. ഞാൻ ഒരു നിയമജ്ഞനല്ല. പക്ഷെ ഒരു കാര്യം തീർച്ചയാണ്. ൧൭൪ ക. വു ണ. കിട്ടാതെ വേല ചെയ്യുന്നതിന്നു ഒരുക്കമില്ലെന്നുള്ള അഭിപ്രായം ആദ്യം പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചിട്ടുള്ളത് തൊഴിലാളികളാണ്. അതു വകവെച്ചു കൊടുക്കുവാൻ മുതലാളി സമ്മതിച്ചില്ല. മുതലാളി നിശ്ചയിച്ച കുറഞ്ഞ കൂലിക്ക് പണിയെടുക്കുവാൻ സമ്മതിക്കാതെ പിറേറ ദിവസം മുതൽ അവർ ജോലിക്കു വന്നില്ല. അതങ്ങിനെ ഇപ്പോഴും തുടരുന്നു. പല പ്രസംഗങ്ങളും പല യോഗങ്ങളും പല റ്റോക്സ് വിളികളും ഇങ്ങിനെ പല ഘോഷങ്ങളും ഫാക്ടറിക്ക് ചുറ്റും ഇപ്പോഴും നടക്കുന്നുണ്ട് എന്ന് എനിക്കറിയാം. നടന്നതും നടക്കുന്നതുമായ സംഗതികൾ ഇതാണ്.

എനിക്കു മറ്റൊരു സംഗതി ഇവിടെ അറിയുവാനുണ്ട്. അതു വേറെ ഒന്നല്ല. പ്രബലനാരായ മുതലാളികൾ—കോടി കോടി ഉറപ്പിക മുതലാളികളുള്ള ഗംഭീരമായ മുതലാളികൾ—പലവിധ അനീതികളും നിയമവിരുദ്ധമായി നടത്തിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഈ ഘട്ടത്തിൽ ഈ അസൂയയിട്ടുള്ള ഒരു വിഭാഗം ബ്രാഹ്മണനെ മാത്രം ഇങ്ങിനെ ബുദ്ധിമുട്ടിക്കുന്നതിന്റെ കാരണമെന്താണെന്നു എനിക്കു മനസ്സിലാകുന്നില്ല. മുതലാളിയും മനുഷ്യനാണ്. ഒരു തൊഴിലാളിതന്നെ ഒരു മുതലാളി ഉപദ്രവിച്ചു എന്നു പറഞ്ഞാൽ രാജ്യത്തിന്റെ അങ്ങേ അറ്റം മുതൽ ഇങ്ങേ അറ്റംവരെ പണിമുടക്കിനും പ്രചരണം നടത്തുന്നതിനും അനേകം തൊഴിലാളികൾ ഉണ്ട്. എന്നാൽ മുതലാളിക്ക് ഇതൊന്നും സാദ്ധ്യമല്ല.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. കെ. ഡീവർ : മുതലാളിയുടെ കാര്യം പറയുവാൻ തുറന്നിട്ടുള്ളതൊരു മെമ്പറുണ്ടല്ലോ.

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : തൊഴിലാളികളും മുതലാളികളും തമ്മിലുള്ള വഴക്കുകളെ സംബന്ധിച്ചിടത്തോളം അതിൽ എത്രത്തോളം ഇടപെടുവാൻ സാധിക്കും അതിൽ നിന്നു തൊഴിലാളികളെ എത്രത്തോളം രക്ഷിക്കുവാൻ സാധിക്കുമെന്നുള്ള പരീക്ഷണത്തിന്നു വേണ്ടി മാത്രമാണ് ഈ ഓൺലൈൻ ബ്രാഹ്മണനെ പിടികൂടിയത്. അതു പൌരജ്ഞത്തിന് പോരാത്തതാണ്. എത്രായാലും ഇതൊരു ലോക്കൗട്ടല്ലെന്നാണ് എന്റെ അഭിപ്രായം.

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. കെ. കണ്ണൻ : ശരിയായിട്ട് അന്വേഷിച്ചറിഞ്ഞിട്ടുള്ള അഭിപ്രായമാണോ?

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. നാരായണമേനോൻ : അതിനെപ്പറ്റി സംശയിക്കുവാനില്ല. പരമാമം അറിയാതെ ഒരു കാര്യവും ഞാൻ പറയാറില്ല. ഇതിൽ കൂടുതലായി എനിക്കു പറയുവാനില്ല. ഞാൻ ഈ പ്രമേയത്തെ ശക്തിയായിട്ട് എടുക്കുന്നു.

Rama Varmha Tampuran, M.B.E., (Secretary to Government): Mr. President Sir, Government have been watching with great interest the discussions on this motion. Two points have been made out; one was that Government had not acted briskly and in time on receipt of information about the alleged lock-out. The other point was the Labour Department as now constituted is not able to cope with the heavy responsibilities that it has.

As regards point No. 1, the Joint Secretary has made it very clear that the first time Government were informed of the alleged lock-out definitely was on the 24th November, hardly 5 days ago. Since then they have left no stone unturned in getting through this business as quickly as possible. They had naturally to rely upon the officers who could go to the spot and made enquiries before they could decide whether this will be a case for appropriate action by them. Therefore naturally they have had to call for the reports from the Police Department as well as from the Labour Department. They should be given atleast two or three days to make enquiries and submit their reports. Then again they had to refer the matter to their law officers. They had more or less completed their investigations by this time and they expect to come to definite conclusions on the question without any more delay. I am sure that the Hon'ble Member who moved this motion should be satisfied with the statement Government made on this point. The Hon'ble Member could have in his mind only the point that there should be no laxity in dealing with affairs of this kind, affairs which affect the livelihood of poor labourers; I assure the Hon'ble Member on behalf of the Government that there had not been any laxity and that they will act with the greatest promptitude on the basis of the information they have now before them.

As regards point No. 2 the position of the Labour Department as it is the Government have no reluctance at all to state that if there is any deficiency they will be the first to rectify it. After all, when they constituted a new Department like this as I explained the other day, it was with the only intention of strengthening the hands of the Government in carrying out their responsibilities with regard to the labour problems that are achieving greater importance day after day. Government are alive to the urgency and the difficulties of the new situation that are arising and it is to help them that they have created this new Labour Department. They created the Department just two months ago. If they find that that is not sufficiently staffed or usefully staffed they could have no hesitation whatsoever to amplify it to any extent and make it effectively useful. They are certainly looking into that question with great care and immediately if there is any deficiency to be set right they will certainly do so. I hope the House is now satisfied with the stand they have taken in this matter. I request that the House should not now press this motion to a division.

***Mr. P. K. Dewar (Nominated):** Mr. President Sir, While I accept the assurance held out by the Government I have had to explain my position once more. I am reminded of an ordinary saying that the complainant becomes the accused. I have come here with a complaint. The Joint Secretary has now taken up his duty to accuse me of the delay in appraising him of the actual situation. It is not a fact. Here the Hon'ble Joint Secretary himself read out a telegram which reached the Government on the 8th of November. Therefore it cannot be said that Government were not aware of the fact of the wage-cut.

Mr. C. J. Mathew (Joint Secretary to Government): I said "lock-out" not "wage-cut".

Mr. P. K. Dewar (Nominated): There was the lock-out also, on the 7th November and it is not a fact to say that only 8 workers were locked-out. The resolution is very important for the working class every where in the world. The Management locked all of them out and it is not a fact also to say that only 8 persons were sent out. The actual number of workmen working there is 22; 16 weavers and 6 spinners; thus there are 22 workers in all. Now 16 of them are out. It is not also a fact to say that the Labour Commissioner or the Police Commissioner had no opportunity to go over there and see that there was a lock-out from the 13th of November. On the 18th of November a leaflet was published which the Local Police and their intelligence department were also expected to know. Members of the intelligence department tried to get into private meetings also, even close-door meetings. Even the intelligence department or the police did not know that there was a meeting or there was a leaflet like this.

The leaflet says:

“൨-൭-൦൦ തിയിതി കൂലി തീർത്ത സമയം ൧ രൂ. വെച്ചു കൊടുക്കുവാൻ മാനേജ് മെൻറ മുതിർന്നതിനാൽ തൊഴിലാളികൾ കൂലി വാങ്ങിയില്ല. പിറ്റേ ദിവസം പതിവു

*Speech not corrected by the Hon'ble Member.

CLC III—4

പോലെ അവർ കമ്പനിയിൽ ചെന്നപ്പോൾ മർക് പ്രകാരം കൂലി സമ്മതിച്ചെന്ന എഴുതി ഒപ്പിട്ട് കൊടുത്താൽ മാത്രമേ പണിക്കർ എടുക്കുകയുള്ളൂ എന്നു മാനേജ്മെന്റ് പറയുകയും അതിന്നു സമ്മതിക്കാത്തതുകൊണ്ട് തൊഴിലാളികളെ പുറത്താക്കി ലോക്കൗട്ട് തുടരുകയും ചെയ്തു."

മിസ്റ്റർ കെ. എസ്സ്. പണിക്കർ: അങ്ങിനെ എത്ര ജന്മമുണ്ടാകും പോയി?

മിസ്റ്റർ പി. കെ. ഡീവർ: Forty (നാല്പതാളികൾ)

I am not concerned with the capital of the industry. It is a limited concern and there are Malayalies belonging to these places as shareholders. There are several other concerns in Trippunithura properly working with a capital of ten thousand or fifteen thousand. None of these concerns resorted to a wage-cut. The Labour Commissioner, when he went over there on the 9th he promised to go over there again, but the Hon'ble Secretary now says that the Labour Commissioner did not subsequently interview any of the workers there. When I met him last in the M.L.C. Quarters I told him that there was a lock-out continuing. The workers also told him that there was a lock-out. I have also met personally the Deputy Commissioner of Police sometime back and told him that he must go and take proper step. Therefore it cannot be said that the Government had no opportunity. I do not think it is proper, to throw the whole blame on the Member for Labour. I may assure the Government that the Member for Labour is having a very troublesome period now. From everywhere he is receiving telegrams. Government are also responsible for all these. As regards the advocacy here brought forward by the Hon'ble Member for Trippunithura I am not at all astonished at it. I know the change that has taken place in the Hon'ble Member since some time. I can also assure the House that what the Hon'ble Member has now described here as "loitering about" is not a fact at all. Probably, of course, I saw the Hon'ble Member in company with certain people and I know what was the source of information that he received. Wherefrom he got the inspiration, I know and I know what is behind the inspiration also. I can also talk to-day in my own tongue. I would have replied in the same manner he has done. Because the President is here, I am now with my broken English, trying to explain things to him. It is not a fact, Sir, to say that the workers were loitering there. It was definitely a lock-out. If only Government will be able to examine the records of the Management it will be seen that the Manager was consistently refusing to admit the workers in because the workers failed to give an undertaking in writing. He insisted upon the undertaking and to say that the workers loitered about is an argument which even the management has not tried to bring in. I am so sorry that the Hon'ble Member for Trippunithura who for some time was posing as the working classes' man, as the poor men's man, has now become the advocate of the capitalists, smaller or bigger. I can also assure the Hon'ble Member for Trippunithura that we are not concerned with the employer, whether he is a big man or a small man. If I am employer to-morrow I may probably prove to be a worse man. I should now attack the employer when he is against the interests of the worker. The Member for Trippunithura has been here trying to impress upon the House that this is a resolution of the attempt of some political party in Trippunithura to try to placate the workers, under some pretext or other and to create trouble. It is not a fact. I know that my friend the member for Trippunithura cannot see eye to eye with the political parties there. He has become a sort of out-caste from all political parties. He now takes this opportunity to give vent to his grievances against the political parties which have now made him an out caste. I only sympathies with him. It is not because the political parties wanted to create trouble. But the management of the Alliance Industries thought it fit to look out the Factory because there is a political party. The political party had not advised the management to resort to this lock-out. I, therefore, make it clear to the Government and this House that there has been a clear lock-out and that Government have not taken prompt action. It may be that the Secretariat had not proper information from the officers concerned. Whatever be that, now that the Government have promised to take proper action and to see that the workers are not subjected to this sort of keeping out without wages and food, I beg leave of this House to withdraw this motion in the hope that the Government will see that some solution is found out for the trouble that is now going on and see that the action of the management of the Alliance Industries does not give room for others to follow this.

Adjournment motion, by leave, withdrawn.